



Los Angeles County
Department of Regional Planning

Planning for the Challenges Ahead



James E. Hartl, AICP
Director of Planning

February 9, 2005

CERTIFIED MAIL - RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Michael Sun
529 E. Valley Blvd. #228
San Gabriel, CA 91776

RE: CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 00-253-(5)
31425 The Old Road, Castaic

Dear Applicant:

The Regional Planning Commission, by its action of February 9, 2005, **APPROVED** the above described conditional use permit case.

The applicant or **ANY OTHER INTERESTED PERSON** may **APPEAL** the Regional Planning Commission's decision to the Board of Supervisors through the office of Violet Varona-Lukens, Executive Officer, Room 383, Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, 500 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012. Contact the Executive Office for the necessary forms and the amount of the appeal fee at (213) 974-1426. The appeal must be postmarked or delivered in person within 15 days after this notice is received by the applicant.

If no appeal is made during this 15-day period, the Regional Planning Commission action is final. Upon completion of the 15-day appeal period, please notarize the attached acceptance form and **hand deliver** this form and any other required fees or material to the planner assigned to your case. It is advisable that you **make an appointment** with the case planner to assure that processing will be completed expeditiously. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact the Zoning Permits Section at (213) 974-6443.

Very truly yours,

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING
James E. Hartl, AICP, Director of Planning

Russell J. Fricano

Russell J. Fricano, Ph. D., AICP
Supervising Regional Planner
Zoning Permits Section

Enclosures: Findings and Conditions, Affidavit (Permittee's Completion).

c: Owner, Board of Supervisors; Department of Public Works (Building and Safety); Department of Public Works (Subdivision Mapping); Zoning Enforcement

RJF:MBM

FEB 14 2005

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 00-253-(5)

FINDINGS AND ORDER OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING DATE: September 29, 2004

SYNOPSIS:

The applicant is proposing the construction of a three-story 112-unit hotel ("Hampton Inn & Suites") with adjacent parking for 119 vehicles, two conference rooms, and a swimming pool on a vacant parcel adjacent to the Interstate 5 freeway. The only restaurant facility proposed is breakfast service for guests. The height of the building varies between 29 and 40 feet. The applicant estimates that approximately 400 cubic yards of grading will be required for the construction of the project. All dirt would be balanced on-site. Access to the site is from the Old Road to the west.

PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE COMMISSION

September 29, 2004 Public Hearing

A duly noticed public hearing was held before the Regional Planning Commission on September 29, 2004. Commissioners Valadez and Modugno were absent. The applicant's representatives, Mr. Tom Jerald and Mr. Michael Sun testified and answered questions posed by the Commission. Two persons testified in opposition. Concerns included having a business located across the street from residences, noise, traffic and that there are already sufficient hotels in Castaic. There being no further testimony, the Planning Commission voted (3-0) to close the public hearing, indicate its intent to approve the conditional use permit, and direct staff to prepare the final environmental document and findings and conditions for approval.

Findings

1. The applicant is requesting authorization construction of a three-story 112-unit hotel ("Hampton Inn & Suites") with adjacent parking for 119 vehicles, two conference rooms, and a swimming pool on a vacant parcel in the C-3 (Unlimited Commercial) zone, pursuant to Section 22.28.210 of the Los Angeles County Code.
2. The subject property is located at 31425 The Old Road in the unincorporated community of Castaic in the Castaic Canyon Zoned District.
3. Zoning on the subject property is C-3 (Unlimited Commercial) and is also located within the Castaic Community Standards District (CSD).
4. Surrounding zoning consists of:

North: A-1-7,000 (Light Agricultural – 7,000 square feet minimum area), and C-3;

South: A-1-20,000, CPD (Commercial Planned Development) to the south;

East: C-3; and

West: C-2-DP (Neighborhood Business – Development Program) and A-1-7,000

5. The subject property is presently vacant.

6. Surrounding land uses consist of:

North: Vacant land and the 5-freeway;

South: Vacant land, a road maintenance yard and a mobile home park;

East: 5-freeway and commercial; and

West: Vacant land, single-family residences

7. The Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan (SCVAP) land use designation for the subject property and surrounding area is "Commercial". This designation includes Regional Commercial, which includes uses such as major department stores, automobile centers, and hotels/motels.
8. Conditional Use Permit 90-042 (approved 10/17/1990) approved a 150-unit hotel on the subject site. This permit was never used and expired on 10/17/1993.
9. The site plan depicts the proposed 112-unit hotel ("Hampton Suites") built in three stories and a total of 64,416 square feet. The site plan also depicts a swimming pool and 119 parking spaces, of which 5 are handicap accessible. Access to the site is shown from the Old Road to the west.
10. Pursuant to Section 22.52.1130 of Title 22 of the County Code, parking shall be provided for the proposed hotel as follows: one parking space for each two guestrooms, and one parking space for each suite of guestrooms
11. The applicant's site plan depicts a total of 85 rooms and 27 suites. Forty-three spaces are required for guestrooms; 27 spaces are required for the suites. A total of 70 spaces are required.

11. The applicant's site plan depicts a total of 119 parking spaces (76 standard, 38 compact and 5 handicap accessible spaces). The proposed parking complies with County Code requirements.
12. The proposed development, consisting of a three-story building, varies in height between 29 and 40 feet and complies with the height requirements for the C-3 Zone.
13. The height limit within the Castaic Area CSD is 35 feet for buildings within 500 feet of a residential or agricultural zone. The subject property is within 500 feet of A-1 zoning.
14. The portions of the proposed structure which are higher than 35 feet would not comply with the proposed CSD for this area, however, the CSD permits minor variations that are not materially detrimental to other properties or improvements in the area and that the project remains consistent with the goals and policies of the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan.
15. The portions of the hotel design exceeding the 35 feet height limit are minor and will not have a significant visual effect; the project is consistent with the goals and policies of the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan.
16. Pursuant to Code Section 22.28.220, there are no requirements for yard setbacks within the C-3 zone. The maximum allowed lot coverage is 90% of the net area of a lot. Ten percent of the net area must be landscaped.
17. The Castaic Area CSD requires that the footprint of the building not cover more than 70% of the gross area of the subject site. Buildings, walls and vehicle parking and circulation areas shall be set back a minimum of 20 feet from the front property line in commercial zones; the setback area shall be landscaped with no less than one 15 gallon non-invasive tree for every 150 square feet of setback area.
18. The applicant proposes a total building footprint of 22,394 square feet, or 24.8% lot coverage, and 11,227 square feet (12.5%) of landscaping. The parking area along the Old Road is set back approximately 13 feet from the property line. This project is in compliance with the required lot coverage and landscaping standards for the C-3 zone.
19. The seven foot discrepancy in set-back will not have a significant effect; the project is consistent with the goals and policies of the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan.
20. To reduce the project visual impact from the adjacent freeway (I-5), the applicant shall prepare a landscape plan to be reviewed and approved by the DRP staff biologist. The landscaping shall conform to the requirements

of the Castaic CSD. This requirement is included in the Mitigation Monitoring Program.

21. Pursuant to Section 22.52.890 roof and freestanding business signs shall be permitted on any lot or parcel of land for each street or highway frontage having a continuous distance of 100 feet or more.
22. The Castaic Area CSD prohibits projecting business signs and roof signs.
23. The applicant has not submitted any signage plans. The provision that the applicant shall provide signage plans is included as a condition of approval for this grant.
24. The Department of Regional Planning has determined that a Mitigated Negative Declaration is the appropriate environmental documentation for this project under California Environment Quality Act (CEQA) reporting requirements. An Initial Study was prepared for this project in compliance with the environmental guidelines and reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. The Initial Study showed that there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. The initial study indicated flood, water quality, noise, visual, traffic/access, and cultural resources as potential impacts that will be less than significant with project mitigations. The applicant will comply with the Department of Public Works requirements regarding mitigation for flood/drainage, water quality and traffic issues. Dual paned glass will mitigate freeway noise, and a landscape plan is required to reduce the visual impact from the Interstate-5 freeway.
25. On August 25, 2004, 33 hearing notices were sent to property owners within a 500-foot radius of the subject property. The Castaic Area Town Council, The Castaic Union School District, the Val Verde Civic Association, and the City of Santa Clarita were also notified of the hearing. Legal advertisements were published in The Signal newspaper on August 28, 2004 and in La Opinion on August 31, 2004. Case related materials (factual, hearing notice, environmental documentation and burden of proof statements) were sent to the Canyon Country Jo Anne Darcy library on August 25, 2004 and also posted on the Department of Regional Planning's web site (<http://planning.co.la.ca.us>).
26. During the public hearing one petition containing 102 signatures in opposition to the project was submitted. No letters or phone calls from the public were received regarding this project.
27. Castaic Area Town Council and the Castaic Chamber of Commerce have both indicated their support of the proposed project.

28. A hotel of this size is an appropriate use for this site, as it is located adjacent to the Interstate 5 freeway and would be easily accessible to travelers.
29. The Commission finds that, with appropriate restrictions on its operation as set forth in the conditions of approval, the hotel will be compatible with surrounding land uses.

BASED ON THE FOREGOING, THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION CONCLUDES:

- A. That the proposed use will be consistent with the adopted general plan for the area;
- B. That the requested use at the proposed location will not adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area, will not be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site, and will not jeopardize, endanger, or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety and general welfare;
- C. That the proposed site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the yards, walls, fences, parking and loading facilities, landscaping and other development features prescribed in Title 22, or as is otherwise required in order to integrate said use with the uses in the surrounding area; and
- D. That the proposed site is adequately served by highways or streets of sufficient width and improved as necessary to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such use would generate, and by other public or private service facilities as are required.

AND, THEREFORE, the information submitted by the applicant and presented at the public hearing substantiates the required findings for a Conditional Use Permit as set forth in Section 22.56.090, Title 22, of the Los Angeles County Code (Zoning Ordinance).

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

1. After consideration of the Mitigated Negative Declaration together with all comments received during the public review process, the Commission finds on the basis of the whole record before the Commission that there is no substantial evidence the project will have a significant effect on the environment, finds that the Mitigated Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Commission, and adopts the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

2. In view of the findings of fact and conclusions presented above, Conditional Use Permit Case No. 00-253-(5) is **APPROVED**, subject to the attached conditions.

VOTE: 3-0

Concurring: Rew, Modugno, Valadez

Dissenting: none

Abstaining: none

Absent: Bellamy, Helsley

Action Date: February 9, 2005

RJF:MBM
2/9/2005

1. This grant authorizes the use of the subject property for the construction, operation and maintenance of a 112-unit hotel, as depicted on the approved Exhibit "A". The grant is subject to all of the following conditions of approval.
2. Unless otherwise apparent from the context, the term "permittee" shall include the applicant and any other person, corporation, or other entity making use of this grant.
3. This grant shall not be effective for any purpose until the permittee, and the owner of the subject property if other than the permittee, have filed at the office of the Department of Regional Planning their affidavit stating that they are aware of, and agree to accept, all of the conditions of this grant and that the conditions of the grant have been recorded as required by Condition No. 8, and until all required monies have been paid pursuant to Condition Nos. 10 and 11.
4. The permittee shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the County, its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against the County or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void or annul this permit approval, which action is brought within the applicable time period of Government Code Section 65009 or any other applicable limitation period. The County shall notify the permittee of any claim, action, or proceeding and the County shall reasonably cooperate in the defense.
5. In the event that any claim, action, or proceeding as described above is filed against the County, the permittee shall within ten days of the filing pay the Department of Regional Planning an initial deposit of \$5,000, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted for the purpose of defraying the expenses involved in the department's cooperation in the defense, including but not limited to, depositions, testimony, and other assistance to permittee or permittee's counsel. The permittee shall also pay the following supplemental deposits, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted:
 - a. If during the litigation process, actual costs incurred reach 80 percent of the amount on deposit, the permittee shall deposit additional funds sufficient to bring the balance up to the amount of the initial deposit. There is no limit to the number of supplemental deposits that may be required prior to completion of the litigation.
 - b. At the sole discretion of the permittee, the amount of an initial or supplemental deposit may exceed the minimum amounts defined herein.

The cost for collection and duplication of records and other related documents will be paid by the permittee in accordance with Los Angeles County Code Section 2.170.010.

6. This grant shall expire unless used within 2 years from the date of approval. A one-year time extension may be requested in writing with the payment of the applicable fee, at least six (6) months before the expiration date.
7. If any provision of this grant is held or declared to be invalid, the permit shall be void and the privileges granted hereunder shall lapse.
8. Prior to the use of this grant, the terms and conditions of the grant shall be recorded in the office of the County Recorder. In addition, upon any transfer or lease of the subject property during the term of this grant, the permittee shall promptly provide a copy of the grant and its terms and conditions to the transferee or lessee, as applicable, of the subject property.

9. **This grant shall terminate on February 9, 2025.**

Upon written application of the permittee made no less than six (6) months prior to January 5, 2025, the term of this grant shall be extended by the Director of Planning for a period not to exceed twenty (20) years, as provided herein below. The Director shall grant such extension unless it finds one of the following: (1) that the permittee has failed to adhere to the conditions of approval and such failure has not been timely corrected upon written notice thereof, and (2) that the use is not in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations. If either of the foregoing findings is made by the Director, the extension may be denied. Subsequent extensions may be granted by the Commission upon written application made no less than six (6) months prior to the expiration of the previous extension.

10. The subject property shall be maintained and operated in full compliance with the conditions of this grant and any law, statute, ordinance, or other regulation applicable to any development or activity on the subject property. Failure of the permittee to cease any development or activity not in full compliance shall be a violation of these conditions. Prior to the use of this grant, the permittee shall deposit with the County of Los Angeles the sum of **\$1,500.00**. These monies shall be placed in a performance fund that shall be used exclusively to compensate the Department of Regional Planning for all expenses incurred while inspecting the premises to determine the permittee's compliance with the conditions of approval, including adherence to development in accordance with the approved site plan on file. The fund provides for **(10) biennial inspections of the site. Inspections shall be unannounced.**

If additional inspections are required to ensure compliance with the conditions of this grant, or if any inspection discloses that the subject property is being used in violation of any condition of this grant, the permittee shall be financially responsible for and shall reimburse the Department of Regional Planning for all additional inspections and for any enforcement efforts necessary to bring the

subject property into compliance. The amount charged for additional inspections shall be the amount equal to the recovery cost at the time of payment (currently \$150.00 per inspection). If the term of the grant is extended, additional monies sufficient to provide for additional biennial inspections shall be deposited with the County for the life of the grant. The amount due for such inspections shall be the amount equal to the recovery cost at the time of payment.

11. Within five (15) days of the approval date of this grant, the permittee shall remit a **\$25.00** processing fee payable to the County of Los Angeles in connection with the filing and posting of a Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21152 of the Public Resources Code.
12. Notice is hereby given that any person violating a provision of this grant is guilty of a misdemeanor. Notice is further given that the Regional Planning Commission or a hearing officer may, after conducting a public hearing, revoke or modify this grant, if the Commission or hearing officer finds that these conditions have been violated or that this grant has been exercised so as to be detrimental to the public health or safety or so as to be a nuisance.
13. All requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and of the specific zoning of the subject property must be complied with unless specifically modified by this grant, as set forth in these conditions or shown on the approved plans.
14. Upon approval of this grant, the permittee shall contact the Fire Prevention Bureau of the Los Angeles County Forester and Fire Warden to determine what facilities may be necessary to protect the property from fire hazard. Any necessary facilities shall be provided to the satisfaction of and within the time periods established by said Department.
15. All structures shall comply with the requirements of the Division of Building and Safety of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.
16. The property shall be developed and maintained in substantial conformance with the approved Exhibit "A". In the event that subsequent revised plans are submitted, the permittee shall submit three (3) copies of the proposed plans to the Director for review and approval. All revised plans must be accompanied by the written authorization of the property owner.
17. Within sixty (60) days of the approval date of this grant, the permittee shall submit to the Director of Planning for approval three copies of sign elevations depicting any proposed signs on the subject property. Signs shall be in conformance with Part 10 of Section 22.52 of the County Code.

18. All structures, walls, and fences open to public view shall remain free of extraneous markings, drawings, or signage. These shall include any of the above that do not provide pertinent information about said premises.
19. In the event such extraneous markings occur, the permittee shall remove or cover said markings, drawings, or signage within 24 hours of such occurrence, weather permitting. Paint utilized in covering such markings shall be of a color that matches, as closely as possible, the color of the adjacent surfaces. The only exceptions shall be seasonal decorations.
20. The construction, operation and maintenance of a 112-unit hotel is further subject to all of the following conditions:
 - a. During construction, the permittee and his contractor shall comply with Sections 12.12.010 – 12.12.100 of the Los Angeles County Code regarding building construction noise;
 - b. The permittee shall maintain all areas of the premises over which the permittee has control in a neat and orderly fashion, free of litter and debris. All required landscaping shall be continuously maintained in good condition, including proper pruning, weeding, removal of litter, fertilizing and replacement of plants when necessary;
 - c. A minimum of 70 parking spaces shall be maintained on site, five (5) of which shall be handicapped/van accessible;
 - d. The permittee shall comply with the attached "Project Changes/Conditions Due to Environmental Evaluation" and the corresponding Mitigation Monitoring Program. The applicant shall deposit the sum of \$3,000 with the Department of Regional Planning to defray the cost of reviewing and verifying the information contained in the required mitigation monitoring reports. This deposit is due and payable within 30 days of the approval date of this grant.
 - e. The permittee shall comply with the conditions of the County of Los Angeles Fire Department as outlined in their memorandum dated July 15, 2003 (attached hereto);
 - f. The permittee shall comply with the conditions of the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works conditions as outlined in their memorandum dated December 18, 2002 (attached hereto);
 - g. The use authorized hereby shall be conducted at all times with due regard

for the character of the surrounding neighborhood, and the right is reserved to the Regional Planning Commission to impose additional corrective conditions, if, in the Commission's opinion, such conditions are proven necessary for the protection of persons in the neighborhood or occupants of adjacent property;

- h. Amplified sound equipment, music or public address systems intended to be audible outside the building is prohibited;
- i. Security lighting shall be low intensity, shielded, at low height, and directed downward;
- j. The permittee shall maintain a current contact name, address, and phone number on file with the Department of Regional Planning at all times; and
- k. Tractor-trailer and commercial truck parking is expressly prohibited at the subject hotel and along portions of the Old Road across from or adjacent to the subject property. The permittee shall direct hotel guests to park said vehicles in designated off-site truck parking areas.

Attachments:

Mitigation Monitoring Program

County Fire Department letter dated July 15, 2003

Department of Public Works letter dated December 18, 2002

RJF:MBM

2/2/05

MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM
PROJECT NUMBER 00-253

Mitigation	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Responsible Agency or Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
Flood To mitigate project's potential impact on drainage, the applicant shall comply with all requirements of the approved drainage concept to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works.	Compliance with approved drainage concept	Prior to issuance of any grading or building permits, whichever occurs first	Applicant	Public Works
Water Quality The applicant shall comply with all pertinent NPDES requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.	Approval or waiver of the NPDES permits.	Prior to issuance of any grading or building permits, whichever occurs first	Applicant	Public Works Regional Water Quality Control Board
Noise All windows and glass doors facing east, north, and south shall be glazed with STC 32 glazing.	Review and approval of Exhibit "A"	Prior to issuance of building permits	Applicant	Regional Planning Public Works Building and Safety
Visual The applicant shall prepare a Landscape Plan to be reviewed and approved by the DRP prior to issuance of any grading permits. Landscaping shall consist of locally indigenous, native plants.	Review and approval of Landscape Plan.	Prior to issuance of any grading or building permits, whichever occurs first	Applicant	Regional Planning
Traffic/Access The applicant shall prepare detailed striping plans to the Department of Public Works (DPW) for review and approval prior to issuance of any grading permits. Adequate pavement shall be provided to the satisfaction of the DPW.	Review and approval of detailed striping plans	Prior to issuance of any grading or building permits, whichever occurs first	Applicant	Public Works
The applicant shall enter a secured agreement with the DPW to contribute \$91,730 toward the installation of traffic	Agreement with the DPW.	Prior to issuance of any grading or building permits, whichever occurs first	Applicant	Public Works

MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

PROJECT NUMBER 00-253

Mitigation	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Responsible Agency or Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
signals at the intersections determined by the DPW. The applicant may elect to conduct a revised traffic study to reevaluate the pro rata share of cost due to project changes.				
Other The applicant shall prepare a waste reduction/recycling plan to be reviewed by the DPW Environmental Programs prior to issuance of building permits. A copy of the said plan shall be forwarded to the Department of Regional Planning (DRP).	Review and approval of a waste reduction/recycling plan.	Prior to issuance of any grading or building permits, whichever occurs first	Applicant	Public Works
Cultural Resources The applicant shall agree to suspend construction in the vicinity of a cultural resource encountered during ground-disturbing activities at the site, and leave the resource in place until a qualified archaeologist can examine them and determine appropriate mitigation measures.	Suspension of construction activities until a qualified archaeologist can examine them and determine appropriate mitigation measures	Upon encounter of cultural resource	Applicant	Regional Planning
Mitigation Compliance As a means of ensuring compliance of all above mitigation measures, the applicant is responsible for submitting annual mitigation compliance report to the DRP for review and for replenishing the mitigation monitoring account if necessary until such time as all mitigation measures have been implemented.	Submittal of annual Mitigation Measure Compliance report and replenishment of Mitigation Monitoring account	Annual under such time as all mitigation measures have been implemented.	Applicant	Regional Planning

STAFF USE ONLY

PROJECT NUMBER: 00-253

CASES: CUP



***** INITIAL STUDY *****

**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING**

GENERAL INFORMATION

I.A. Map Date: 6/10/03 Staff Member: Hsiao-ching Chen

Thomas Guide: 4369 G-7 USGS Quad: Newhall

Location: 31426 The Old Road, Castaic, CA 91384

Description of Project: The proposed project is for a Conditional Use Permit for the construction and operation of a three-story, 112-room limited-service lodging facility with accessory parking spaces for 119 vehicles. The facility also include an outdoor swimming pool. A previous application, CUP No. 90-042, for a 150-room motel on the same site was approved on 10/17/1990 but the permit was never used and expired on 10/17/1993. The site is therefore still vacant.

Gross Area: 90,130 sq.ft.

Environmental Setting: The project site is situated along the west side of the Golden State Freeway, northeast of the intersection of Parker Road and The Old Road, and adjacent to a residential area. Nearby parcels along the eastern frontage of The Old Road and across the Interstate Freeway are similarly zoned for commercial uses (i.e., C-3) and currently possess a variety of highway oriented services.

Zoning: C-3 (Unlimited Commercial)

General Plan: Low Density Residential

Community/Area Wide Plan: Commercial (Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan)

IMPACT ANALYSIS MATRIX

		ANALYSIS SUMMARY (See individual pages for details)			
CATEGORY	FACTOR	Pg	Less than Significant Impact/No Impact		
			Less than Significant Impact with Project Mitigation		Potentially Significant Impact
					Potential Concern
HAZARDS	1. Geotechnical	5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	2. Flood	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Drainage concept approval required</i>
	3. Fire	7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	4. Noise	8	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Site immediately adjacent to I-5 Freeway</i>
RESOURCES	1. Water Quality	9	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>NPDES permit required.</i>
	2. Air Quality	10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	3. Biota	11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	4. Cultural Resources	12	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Potential underground artifacts</i>
	5. Mineral Resources	13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	6. Agriculture Resources	14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	7. Visual Qualities	15	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Scenic highway</i>
SERVICES	1. Traffic/Access	16	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>The project is a 112 room lodging facility</i>
	2. Sewage Disposal	17	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	3. Education	18	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	4. Fire/Sheriff	19	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	5. Utilities	20	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Waste reduction mandate</i>
OTHER	1. General	21	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	2. Environmental Safety	22	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	3. Land Use	23	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	4. Pop./Hous./Emp./Rec.	24	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Mandatory Findings	25	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DEVELOPMENT MONITORING SYSTEM (DMS) *

As required by the Los Angeles County General Plan, DMS shall be employed in the Initial Study phase of the environmental review procedure as prescribed by state law.

- Development Policy Map Designation: Conservation/Maintenance
- ☒ Yes ☐ No Is the project located in the Antelope Valley, East San Gabriel Valley, Malibu/Santa Monica Mountains or Santa Clarita Valley planning area?
- ☐ Yes ☒ No Is the project at urban density and located within, or proposes a plan amendment to, an urban expansion designation?

If both of the above questions are answered "yes", the project is subject to a County DMS analysis.

☐ Check if DMS printout generated (attached)

Date of printout: _____

☐ Check if DMS overview worksheet completed (attached)

*EIRs and/or staff reports shall utilize the most current DMS information available.

Environmental Finding:

FINAL DETERMINATION: On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning finds that this project qualifies for the following environmental document:

- ☐ NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was determined that this project will not exceed the established threshold criteria for any environmental/service factor and, as a result, will not have a significant effect on the physical environment.

- ☒ MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the changes required for the project will reduce impacts to insignificant levels (see attached discussion and/or conditions).

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was originally determined that the proposed project may exceed established threshold criteria. The applicant has agreed to modification of the project so that it can now be determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the physical environment. The modification to mitigate this impact(s) is identified on the Project Changes/Conditions Form included as part of this Initial Study.

- ☐ ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT*, inasmuch as there is substantial evidence that the project may have a significant impact due to factors listed above as "significant."

- ☐ At least one factor has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to legal standards, and has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets (see attached Form DRP/IA 101). The EIR is required to analyze only the factors not previously addressed.

Reviewed by: Hsiao-ching Chen

Date: _____

Approved by: Daryl Koutnik

Date: 1 MARCH 2004

- ☐ Determination appealed--see attached sheet.
- ☒ This proposed project is exempt from Fish and Game CEQA filing fees. There is no substantial evidence that the proposed project will have potential for an adverse effect on wildlife or the habitat upon which the wildlife depends. (Fish & Game Code 753.5).

*NOTE: Findings for Environmental Impact Reports will be prepared as a separate document following the public hearing on the project.

HAZARDS - 1. Geotechnical

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project site located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone? San Gabriel Fault is located one mile east of the property (per LA Co Safety Element Plate 1); Earthquake induced landslides (Seismic Hazard Zones Map Newhall Quad.)
- b. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)?
Earthquake induced landslides (Seismic Hazard Zones Map Newhall Quad.)
- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site located in an area having high slope instability?

- d. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project site subject to high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction?
Liquefaction (Seismic Hazard Zones Map Newhall Quad.)
- e. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the proposed project considered a sensitive use (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard?

- f. ☐ ☒ ☐ Will the project entail substantial grading and/or alteration of topography including slopes of more than 25%? Minimal grading will be required
- g. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?
Per Geotechnical Report dated 1/24/90.
- h. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Building Ordinance No. 2225 C Sections 308B, 309, 310 and 311 and Chapters 29 and 70.

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES ☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☒ Project Design ☒ Approval of Geotechnical Report by DPW

Geo report of 1/24/90 on file. DPW concluded no impact from geology and soils standpoint in their memo of 2/24/2001.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **geotechnical** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 2. Flood

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe
a. ☐ ☒ ☐

Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site?

b. ☒ ☐ ☐

Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone?

Castaic Dam Floodway Basin (per LA Co Safety Element Plate 6)

c. ☐ ☒ ☐

Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions?

d. ☐ ☒ ☐

Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from run off?

e. ☐ ☒ ☐

Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area?

f. ☐ ☐ ☐

Other factors (e.g., dam failure)?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Building Ordinance No. 2225 C Section 308A ☐ Ordinance No. 12,114 (Floodways)

☒ Approval of Drainage Concept by DPW on 2/24/04

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size

☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **flood (hydrological)** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☒ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 3. Fire

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

- a. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project site located in a very high fire hazard severity area (Fire Zone 4)?

Fire Zone 4 (per LA Co Safety Element Plate 7)

- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by inadequate access due to lengths, widths, surface materials, turnarounds or grade?

- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area?

- d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards?

- e. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)?

- f. ☐ ☒ ☐ Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?

- g. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

- ☒ Water Ordinance No. 7834 ☒ Fire Ordinance No. 2947 ☒ Fire Regulation No. 8
☒ Fuel Modification/Landscape Plan

- ☐ MITIGATION MEASURES ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Project Design

☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **fire hazard** factors?

- ☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 4. Noise

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project site located near a high noise source (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)?
Golden State Freeway
- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity?

- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project substantially increase ambient noise levels including those associated with special equipment (such as amplified sound systems) or parking areas associated with the project?

- d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project?

- e. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Noise Ordinance No. 11,778

☒ Building Ordinance No. 2225--Chapter 35

☒ MITIGATION MEASURES ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size

☒ Project Design

☒ Compatible Use

Acoustical Analysis dated 01/1991 and DHS letter of 3/30/01 on file. Although the exterior noise level is about 70 CNEL, the interior noise level of 45 dBA will be achieved with appropriate building design and materials. Also noted that this is a commercial lodging facility and not residential. Landscape plan to be required.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by **noise**?

☐ Potentially significant ☒ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 1. Water Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe
a. ☐ ☒ ☐

Is the project site located in an area having known water quality problems and proposing the use of individual water wells?

b. ☐ ☒ ☐

Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system?

☐ ☐ ☐

If the answer is yes, is the project site located in an area having known septic tank limitations due to high groundwater or other geotechnical limitations or is the project proposing on-site systems located in close proximity to a drainage course?

c. ☐ ☐ ☒

Could the project's associated construction activities significantly impact the quality of groundwater and/or storm water runoff to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving water bodies?

Project parking characteristics meet minimum threshold of NPDES requirements.

d. ☐ ☐ ☒

Could the project's post-development activities potentially degrade the quality of storm water runoff and/or could post-development non-storm water discharges contribute potential pollutants to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving bodies?

Project parking characteristics meet minimum threshold of NPDES requirements

e. ☐ ☐ ☐

Other factors? _____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Industrial Waste Permit

☐ Health Code Ordinance No. 7583, Chapter 5

☐ Plumbing Code Ordinance No. 2269

☒ NPDES Permit Compliance (DPW)

☒ MITIGATION MEASURES ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size

☒ See attached mitigations

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **water quality** problems?

☐ Potentially significant ☒ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 2. Air Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Will the proposed project exceed the State's criteria for regional significance (generally (a) 500 dwelling units for residential uses or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for nonresidential uses)?
- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the proposal considered a sensitive use (schools, hospitals, parks) and located near a freeway or heavy industrial use?
- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Will the project increase local emissions to a significant extent due to increased traffic congestion or use of a parking structure, or exceed AQMD thresholds of potential significance per Screening Tables of the CEQA Air Quality Handbook?
- d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Will the project generate or is the site in close proximity to sources which create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions?
- e. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
- f. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
- g. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?
- h. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors: _____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Health and Safety Code Section 40506

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Project Design

☐ Air Quality Report

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **air quality**?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 3. Biota

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe
a. ☐ ☒ ☐

Is the project site located within a Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer, or coastal Sensitive Environmental Resource (ESHA, etc.), or is the site relatively undisturbed and natural?

b. ☐ ☒ ☐

Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas?

c. ☐ ☒ ☐

Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a blue, dashed line, located on the project site?

d. ☐ ☒ ☐

Does the project site contain a major riparian or other sensitive habitat (e.g., coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, sycamore riparian woodland, wetland, etc.)?

e. ☐ ☒ ☐

Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)?

f. ☐ ☒ ☐

Is the project site habitat for any known sensitive species (federal or state listed endangered, etc.)?

g. ☐ ☐ ☐

Other factors (e.g., wildlife corridor, adjacent open space linkage)?

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES ☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size

☐ Project Design

☐ Oak Tree Permit

☐ ERB/SEATAC Review

The site was developed as a single-family residence in the past.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **biotic resources**?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 4. Archaeological / Historical / Paleontological

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site in or near an area containing known archaeological resources or containing features (drainage course, spring, knoll, rock outcroppings, or oak trees) which indicate potential archaeological sensitivity?
- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources?
- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites? No sites have been recorded within one mile radius per UCLA Archaeological Information Center.
- d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5?
- e. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
- f. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

☒ MITIGATION MEASURES ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☒ Phase I Archaeology Report

Phase I dated 03/14/90 on file. Stop work condition will be imposed.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **archaeological**, **historical**, or **paleontological** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☒ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 5.Mineral Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe
a. ☐ ☒ ☐

Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

b. ☐ ☒ ☐

Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource discovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

c. ☐ ☐ ☐

Other factors? _____

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size

☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **mineral** resources?

☐ Potentially significant

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 6. Agriculture Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?
- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?
- d. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors?

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **agriculture** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 7. Visual Qualities

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe
a. ☒ ☐ ☐

Is the project site substantially visible from or will it obstruct views along a scenic highway (as shown on the Scenic Highway Element), or is it located within a scenic corridor or will it otherwise impact the viewshed?

Golden State Freeway is a first priority scenic highway.

b. ☐ ☒ ☐

Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?

c. ☐ ☒ ☐

Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area, which contains unique aesthetic features?

d. ☐ ☐ ☒

Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features? Building height will be 45 feet high which exceeds the maximum height limit of 35 stated in the proposed Castaic CSD..

e. ☐ ☒ ☐

Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems?

f. ☐ ☐ ☐

Other factors (e.g., grading or land form alteration):

☒ MITIGATION MEASURES ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size

☐ Project Design

☐ Visual Report

☒ Compatible Use

The height of the proposed motel is in compliance with what is allowed within C-3 zone but inconsistent with the proposed Castaic CSD. However, there are established land uses with buildings of similar size and bulk situated within the immediate vicinity of the project site. Landscape plan to be reviewed and approved by the DRP..

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on scenic qualities?

☐ Potentially significant

☒ Less than significant with project mitigation

☐ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 1. Traffic/Access

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Does the project contain 25 dwelling units, or more and is it located in an area with known congestion problems (roadways or intersections)?

- b. ☐ ☐ ☒ Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions?

- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions?
119 parking spaces are provided
- d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Will inadequate access during an emergency (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area?

- e. ☒ ☐ ☐ Will the congestion management program (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds of 50 peak hour vehicles added by project traffic to a CMP highway system intersection or 150 peak hour trips added by project traffic to a mainline freeway link be exceeded?
The project traffic exceeds CMP threshold of 80 rooms for hotel projects.
- f. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

- g. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

☒ MITIGATION MEASURES ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Project Design ☒ Traffic Report ☒ Consultation with Traffic & Lighting Division

Traffic Study dated 4/13/90 and DPW Traffic & Lighting comments dated 4/11/01 on file. Comply with all DPW recommendations prior to issuance of grading permit.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **traffic/access** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☒ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 2. Sewage Disposal

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ If served by a community sewage system, could the project create capacity problems at the treatment plant?
- _____
- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project create capacity problems in the sewer lines serving the project site?
- _____
- c. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____
- _____
- _____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

- ☐ Sanitary Sewers and Industrial Waste Ordinance No. 6130
- ☐ Plumbing Code Ordinance No. 2269

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **sewage disposal** facilities?

- ☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 3. Education

N/A

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☐ ☐ Could the project create capacity problems at the district level?

- b. ☐ ☐ ☐ Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools which will serve the project site?

- c. ☐ ☐ ☐ Could the project create student transportation problems?

- d. ☐ ☐ ☐ Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand?

- e. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES ☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Site Dedication ☐ Government Code Section 65995 ☐ Library Facilities Mitigation Fee

Non-residential project.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **educational** facilities/services?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 4. Fire/Sheriff Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe
a. ☐ ☒ ☐

Could the project create staffing or response time problems at the fire station or sheriff's substation serving the project site?

Nearest fire station is one-half mile away.

b. ☐ ☒ ☐

Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area?

c. ☐ ☐ ☐

Other factors? _____

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES ☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☒ Fire Mitigation Fees

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **fire/sheriff** services?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 5. Utilities/Other Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe
a. ☐ ☒ ☐

Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate public water supply to meet domestic needs or to have an inadequate ground water supply and proposes water wells?

b. ☐ ☒ ☐

Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting needs?

c. ☐ ☒ ☐

Could the project create problems with providing utility services, such as electricity, gas, or propane?

d. ☐ ☐ ☒

Are there any other known service problem areas (e.g., solid waste)?

cumulative concerns and waste reduction requirements.

e. ☐ ☒ ☐

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services or facilities (e.g., fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, roads)?

f. ☐ ☐ ☐

Other factors? _____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Plumbing Code Ordinance No. 2269

☐ Water Code Ordinance No. 7834

☒ MITIGATION MEASURES ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size

☐ Project Design

Waste reduction program to be reviewed and approved by DPW.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **utilities/services**?

☐ Potentially significant

☒ Less than significant with project mitigation

☐ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 1. General

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe
a. ☐ ☒ ☐

Will the project result in an inefficient use of energy resources?

b. ☐ ☒ ☐

Will the project result in a major change in the patterns, scale, or character of the general area or community?

c. ☐ ☒ ☐

Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land?

d. ☐ ☐ ☐

Other factors? _____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ State Administrative Code, Title 24, Part 5, T-20 (Energy Conservation)

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot size ☐ Project Design

☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to any of the above factors? _____

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 2. Environmental Safety

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Are any hazardous materials used, transported, produced, handled, or stored on-site?

- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any hazardous wastes stored on-site?

- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially adversely affected?

- d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Have there been previous uses which indicate residual soil toxicity of the site?

- e. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment?

- f. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

- g. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or environment?

- h. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project result in a safety hazard for people in a project area located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip?

- i. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

- j. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Toxic Clean up Plan

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact relative to **public safety**?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 3. Land Use

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the plan designation(s) of the subject property?

- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property?

- c. Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the following applicable land use criteria:
- ☐ ☒ ☐ Hillside Management Criteria?
- ☐ ☒ ☐ SEA Conformance Criteria?
- ☐ ☐ ☐ Other? _____
- d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project physically divide an established community?

- e. ☐ ☐ ☒ Other factors? The proposed hotel has a building height of 45 feet, while the proposed CSD maximum height will be 35 feet if the commercial building is within 500 feet of a residential or agricultural zone.

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES ☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

At the time of the environmental evaluation, the proposed Castaic CSD has not been adopted by the Board of Supervisors yet. The project impacts on land use is less than significant in its approved form.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **land use** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 4. Population/Housing/Employment/Recreation

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?

- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project induce substantial direct or indirect growth in an area (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?

- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?

- d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project result in a substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)?

- e. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents?
This is a non-residential project

- f. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- g. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **population, housing, employment, or recreational** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Based on this Initial Study, the following findings are made:

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?
-
- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Does the project have possible environmental effects which are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.
-
- c. ☐ ☐ ☒ Will the environmental effects of the project cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?
- Noise, traffic

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the environment?

- ☐ Potentially significant ☒ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

**PROJECT CHANGES/CONDITIONS
DUE TO ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION**

PROJECT No. CUP 00-253

The Department of Regional Planning (DRP) staff has determined that the following conditions or changes in the project are necessary in order to assure that there will be no substantial evidence that the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment.

The applicant shall deposit the sum of \$3,000 with the DRP within 30 days of permit approval in order to defray the cost of reviewing and verifying the information contained in the reports by a Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP).

FLOOD

To mitigate project's potential impact on drainage, the applicant shall comply with all requirements of the approved drainage concept to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works.

WATER QUALITY

To mitigate potential water quality impacts to less than significant, the applicant shall comply with all pertinent NPDES requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works prior to issuance of any grading permits.

NOISE

To reduce noise impact from the I-5, all windows and glass doors facing east, north, and south shall be glazed with STC 32 glazing. The said features shall be noted on the building plan prior to issuance of any building permits.

VISUAL

To reduce the project visual impact from Golden State Highway (i.e., I-5), the applicant shall prepare a Landscape Plan to be reviewed and approved by the DRP prior to issuance of any grading permits. Landscaping shall consist of locally indigenous, native plants.

TRAFFIC/ACCESS

The applicant shall prepare detailed striping plans to the Department of Public Works (DPW) for review and approval prior to issuance of any grading permits. Adequate pavement shall be provided to the satisfaction of the DPW.

The applicant shall enter a secured agreement with the DPW to contribute \$91,730 toward the installation of traffic signals at the intersections determined by the DPW. The applicant may elect to conduct a revised traffic study to reevaluate the pro rata share of the cost identified above.

CULTURE RESOURCES

To reduce potential impacts on cultural resources, the applicant shall agree to suspend construction in the vicinity of a cultural resource encountered during ground-disturbing activities at the site, and leave the resource in place until a qualified archaeologist can examine them and determine appropriate mitigation measures.

OTHERS

The applicant shall prepare a waste reduction/recycling plan to be reviewed by the DPW Environmental Programs prior to issuance of building permits. A copy of the said plan shall be forwarded to the Department of Regional Planning (DRP).

Mitigation Compliance

As a means of ensuring compliance of all above mitigation measures, the applicant and subsequent owner is responsible for submitting annual mitigation compliance report to the DRP for review and for replenishing the mitigation monitoring account if necessary until such time as all mitigation measures have been implemented.

As the applicant, I agree to incorporate these changes/conditions into the project, and understand that the public hearing and consideration by the Hearing Officer and/or Regional Planning Commission will be on the project as changed/conditioned.

Applicant

Date

☐ No response with 10 days. Environmental Determination requires that these changes/conditions be included in the project.

Staff

Date



Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning
320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012
Telephone (213) 974-6443

PROJECT No. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT
00-253-(5)

RPC/HO MEETING DATE
February 9, 2005

CONTINUE TO

AGENDA ITEM

7

PUBLIC HEARING DATE
September 29, 2004

APPLICANT Michael Sun		OWNER Mr. & Mrs. Ya-Yung Yeh		REPRESENTATIVE n/a	
REQUEST Conditional Use Permit: To authorize the construction of a 112-unit hotel in the C-3 (Unlimited Commercial) zone.					
LOCATION/ADDRESS 31425 N. The Old Road			ZONED DISTRICT Castaic Canyon		
ACCESS The Old Road to the west			COMMUNITY Castaic		
			EXISTING ZONING C-3		
SIZE 90,130 square feet	EXISTING LAND USE Vacant		SHAPE Irregular	TOPOGRAPHY sloping	
SURROUNDING LAND USES & ZONING					
North: A-1-7000 (Light Agricultural-7,000 square foot minimum lot), C-3/vacant land and the 5-freeway			East: C-3/5-freeway, commercial		
South: A-1-20,000, CPD (Commercial Planned Development)/vacant land, road maintenance yard, mobile home park			West: C-2-DP (Neighborhood Business – Development Program), A-1-7000/vacant land, single-family residences, church		
GENERAL PLAN	DESIGNATION		MAXIMUM DENSITY	CONSISTENCY	
Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan	C – Commercial		40 units/ac	See Staff Analysis	
ENVIRONMENTAL STATUS Mitigated Negative Declaration					
DESCRIPTION OF SITE PLAN The site plan depicts the proposed 112-unit hotel ("Hampton Suites") built in three stories and a total of 64,416 square feet. The site plan also depicts 119 parking spaces, of which 5 are handicap accessible. Access to the site is shown from the Old Road to the west.					
KEY ISSUES <ul style="list-style-type: none">Satisfaction of Section 22.56.040 of the Los Angeles County Code Title 22, Conditional Use Permit Burden of Proof requirements. <p style="text-align: right;">(If more space is required, use opposite side)</p>					

TO BE COMPLETED ONLY ON CASES TO BE HEARD BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

STAFF CONTACT PERSON Maria Masis		
RPC HEARING DATE(S) September 29, 2004	RPC ACTION DATE February 9, 2005	RPC RECOMMENDATION Approval
MEMBERS VOTING AYE Valadez, Modugno, Rew	MEMBERS VOTING NO -	MEMBERS ABSTAINING (Helsley, Bellamy absent)
STAFF RECOMMENDATION (PRIOR TO HEARING) Approval		
SPEAKERS* (O) 3 (F) 1	PETITIONS (O) 102 (F) -	LETTERS (O) - (F) -

*(O) = Opponents (F) = In Favor